

REMARKS

Claims 32, 35, 39-41, 47, 50 and 51 are presented for consideration, with Claims 32 and 47 being independent.

Claim 47 has been amended to better set forth Applicants' invention and further distinguish it from the cited art.

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended toward their representative during the telephone interview on October 24, 2007. The interview focused primarily on independent Claim 47 and the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and §102(b).

In that regard, Claims 47 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. During the telephone interview, the Examiner's attention was directed to Figure 38 and the accompanying specification beginning on page 82, line 10, for support of Applicants' claimed pulse signal having a first portion and a second portion. As shown, for example, by pulse signal X4 in Figure 38, a signal level of the pulse signal rises up to a first predetermined level (identified by reference numeral 97), which is lower than a maximum level of the pulse signal, and in the second portion a signal level of the pulse signal falls down to a second predetermined level (V_{as}), which is lower than the maximum level of the pulse signal.

As discussed during the interview, the Examiner tentatively agreed to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 47 and 51 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Amano '607. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 47 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprising a plurality of display devices wired in a matrix through a plurality of scanning signal wirings and a plurality of modulated signal wirings, and a driving circuit configured to apply an individual pulse signal as a modulated signal having a modulated pulsewidth to each of the plurality of modulated signal wirings. The pulse signal has a first portion at a leading edge of the pulse signal, a maximum level portion of the pulse signal and a second portion at the trailing edge of the pulse signal. In the first portion, a signal level of the pulse signal rises up to a first predetermined level which is lower than a maximum level of the maximum level portion and is maintained at the first predetermined level during a first predetermined time period. In the second portion, a signal level of the pulse signal falls down to a second predetermined level which is lower than the maximum level of the maximum level portion and is maintained at the second predetermined level during a second predetermined time period.

Amano is directed to a video display system that includes a flat panel with an X and Y matrix. Row lines X and column lines Y are driven to adjust the brightness of the video display by changing the combination of a width and an amplitude of a driving pulse. The Office

Action takes the position that Figure 9 in Amano shows a pulse signal having a first portion and a second portion as set forth in Applicants' Claim 47, relying on the gray scale level 3 and level 15 in Figure 9.

As discussed during the interview, 16 different driving current pulses are displayed in Figure 9, and no individual pulse signal has a first portion and a second portion as set forth in Applicants' Claim 47. As will be appreciated, Claim 47 has been amended to feature a drive circuit configured to apply an individual pulse signal, to further emphasize this feature of Applicants' invention. This provides a high performance image display apparatus capable of suppressing crosstalk between adjacent wirings. None of the individual pulse signals shown in Figure 9 meets the features of Claim 47.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 32, 35, 39-41 and 50 are allowed.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 32 and 47 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 35, 39-41, 50 and 51 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Due consideration and prompt passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDMvnm

FCHS_WS 1706122v1